

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed on June 9, 2005.  
All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-36 are in the case.

Claims 27, 32, 34, and 36 were amended to better claim the invention.

No new claims were added.

At Paragraphs 2-3 of the Office Action Claims 27, 32, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph. Amendment of the claims is believed to satisfy this rejection.

At Paragraphs 4-11 Claims 8, 11-14, 17-26, 28, 30-31, 33, 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cisco Systems Inc. TN3270 Server Implementation, January 22, 1999 (hereinafter Cisco TN3270).

The present invention, as set forth in representative claim 8, comprises in part:

8. A method for generating unique subordinate resource names, comprising:

identifying one or more subordinate resources, each of the one or more subordinate resources related to one of one or more superior resources;

truncating a name of the one or more superior resources; and

***naming each of the one or more subordinate resources as a combination of the truncated name of its related superior resource and an identification (ID) number, the ID number unique to each of the one or more subordinate resources across all of the one or more superior resources.***

Cisco TN3270 at page 13 states as follows.

At Page 13, Table 2-1, fourth row Cisco TN3270 Server Implementation states:

“If you do not use the LU-SEED parameter on the channel-attached router, the LU names on the router default to the first 6 characters of the configured PU followed by the 2-byte hexadecimal number of the respective LOCADDR of this LU.”

This quoted material may be interpreted by use of the following definitions

LU refers to “Logical Unit”.

PU refers to “Physical Unit”.

LOCADDR refers to a local address.

LU-SEED refers to automatic generation of logical unit numbers using a seed parameter.

So that the quoted material may be restated as

If you do not use the logical unit name automatic generation scheme on the channel-attached router, the logical unit names on the router default to the first 6 characters of the configured physical unit followed by the 2-byte hexadecimal number of the respective local address of this logical unit (LU).

Applicant respectfully urges that Cisco TN3270 is silent concerning Applicant's claimed novel ***naming each of the one or more subordinate resources as a combination of the truncated name of its related superior resource and an identification (ID) number, the ID number unique to each of the one or more subordinate resources across all of the one or more superior resources.***

The Cisco TN3270 document simply teaches combining the “first 6 characters of the configured PU” with a 2-byte hexadecimal number of the respective LOCADDR of this LU.” There is no indication in Cisco TN3270 that an ***the ID number unique to each of the one or more subordinate resources across all of the one or more superior resources*** is used.

Furthermore, the Cisco TN3270 “respective LOCADDR of this LU” (emphasis added) may be the same for different logical units. If so, then two different resources could named with identical names. The invention prevents this situation, that is, the

claimed invention uses an *the ID number unique to each of the one or more subordinate resources across all of the one or more superior resources*. That is, the claimed invention uses an ID number which is unique *across all of the one or more superior resources*.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully urges that Cisco TN3270 is legally precluded from anticipating Applicant's claimed novel invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) because of the absence from Cisco TN3270 of Applicant's claimed novel *naming each of the one or more subordinate resources as a combination of the truncated name of its related superior resource and an identification (ID) number, the ID number unique to each of the one or more subordinate resources across all of the one or more superior resources*.

At Paragraphs 12-16 Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-10, 15-16, 27, 29, 32, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cisco TN3270 in view of Shakib et al. U. S. Patent No. 5,812,793 issued September 22, 1998 (hereinafter Shakib).

Shakib discloses using unacknowledged data packets transmitted over a computer network to replicate data stored on a server having a unique ID, to other computers also each having a unique ID.

Applicant respectfully urges that Shakib has no disclosure of Applicant's claimed novel *naming each of the one or more subordinate resources as a combination of the truncated name of its related superior resource and an identification (ID) number, the ID number unique to each of the one or more subordinate resources across all of the one or more superior resources.*

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully urges that both Cisco TN3270 and Shakib, taken either singly or in combination, are legally precluded from rendering Applicant's claimed novel invention unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because of the absence from both of Applicant's claimed novel *naming each of the one or more subordinate resources as a combination of the truncated name of its related superior resource and an identification (ID) number, the ID number unique to each of the one or more subordinate resources across all of the one or more superior resources.*

All independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.


All dependent claims are dependent from independent claims which are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, all dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account

No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. Sidney Johnston".

A. Sidney Johnston  
Reg. No. 29,548  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-2500